Case 4:03-cv-00855-Y Pocument 23 Filed 04/16/04 ORIGINAL

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FORT WORTH DIVISION

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT

By

Deputy

RANDA HAHN

S
S

Deputy

VS.

S
ACTION NO. 4:03-CV-855-Y

S

AMGEN, INC., ET AL.

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO EXTEND AND GRANTING MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion to Extend Deadline for Designating Physicians and Medical Experts, which was filed in this cause on March 12, 2004. Defendants filed a response in opposition to the motion on March 15. As of the date of this order, there has been no reply to Defendants' response. Also pending before the Court is Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, which was filed in this cause on March 15. As of the date of this order, there has been no response in opposition to the motion. After review of the foregoing documents, the record in this cause, and the applicable law, the Court concludes that Plaintiff's Motion to Extend should be denied, and Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment should be granted. Plaintiff has wholly failed to demonstrate good cause for the requested extension of the March 12 deadline to produce expert causation evidence. See FED. R. CIV. P. 6(b). Additionally,

 $^{^{1}}$ Local civil rule 7.1(f) requires that a reply to a response be filed "within 15 days from the date the response is filed."

 $^{^2{\}rm Local}$ civil rule 7.1(e) requires that a response to a motion "be filed within 20 days from the date the motion is filed."

³Plaintiff's motion indicates that she has "identified potential experts" but needs additional time "to forward the necessary documents and medical records to such potential experts . . . , and the potential experts need additional time to review and consider such documents." (Pl.'s Mot. to Extend at 1.) Plaintiff

Plaintiff has failed to present any evidence in response to Defendants' summary-judgment motion creating a genuine issue of material fact regarding the causation issue.

It is, therefore, ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion to Extend Deadline for Designating Physicians and Medical Experts [document number 16] is hereby DENIED.

It is further ORDERED that Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment [document number 18] is hereby GRANTED.

SIGNED April 16, 2004.

STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

wholly fails to explain, however, why these matters could not be completed, with the exercise of due diligence, during the almost three-month period previously allowed by the Court.